



#25  
7/26/03  
DA

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE PATENT APPLICATION OF

HUOTARI

Appln. No.: 08/983,318

Filed: January 15, 1998

Confirmation No.: 1286

Group Art Unit: 2685

Examiner: T. GESESSE

Title: METHOD FOR TRANSMITTING THE IDENTITY OF A CALLING SUBSCRIBER  
TO A CALLED SUBSCRIBER IN A MOBILE COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

July 15, 2003

\* \* \* \* \*

RESPONSE

RECEIVED

JUL 18 2003

Technology Center 2600

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated January 15, 2003, reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 11-19 are pending.

The Office Action indicated that the instant application allegedly fails to distinguish drawings as prior art. According to the Office Action, Applicant's specification allegedly indicates on page 1 that Figure 1 is a drawing to illustrate the set up connection mode of "prior art." However, Applicant respectfully submits that page 1 of the present Application does not disclose that Figure 1 illustrates set up connection in the prior art. To the contrary, page 1 discloses that Figure 1 illustrates a mobile MS<sub>B</sub> terminating call set-up in a GSM-type mobile communication system. Furthermore, page 3 of the present Application discloses that "the invention will be described in more detail by means of a preferred embodiment with reference to Figure 1." Accordingly, because Figure 1 does not merely illustrate the prior-art, Applicant submits that the Drawings are proper.

Claims 11, 12, 14-16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over Serbetcioglu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,511,111). Applicant traverses the rejection because Serbetcioglu et al. fails to disclose all the features recited in the claims.

For example, Serbetcioglu et al. fails to disclose a method of transmitting an identity of a calling subscriber to a called subscriber including transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber in connection with a

07/17/2003 SS1THB1 00000101 033975 08983318

01 FC:1253 930.00 DA

request for routing information, as recited in independent claim 11 and its dependent claim 12. Similarly, Serbetcioglu et al. fails to disclose a mobile communication system including transmitting means for transmitting an identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber in connection with a request for routing information, as recited in independent claim 14 and its dependent claim 15.

Furthermore, Serbetcioglu et al. fails to disclose a combination of a visitor location register plus mobile switching center including a second interface toward a home location register for receiving an identity of the calling subscriber in connection with a request for routing information relating to the called subscriber, as recited in independent claim 16.

Additionally, Serbetcioglu et al. fails to disclose a home location register including a second interface toward a combination of a visitor location register plus mobile switching center, or VMSC, for requesting routing information relating to the called subscriber and for transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to said VMSC, as recited in independent claim 18.

To the contrary, Serbetcioglu et al. merely relates to caller name and identification with caller screening, including the use of a conventional request of routing information and Calling Line Indication (CLI), but without regard to any request for routing information. For example, Serbetcioglu et al. teaches that "digits of the caller's line will be transmitted, provided CLI is present and CLI delivery to the called party is enabled," (column 3, lines 34-36). However, the conventional CLI-based technique of Serbetcioglu et al. is known in the art, and Serbetcioglu et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest transmitting a calling party identity to a called party's MSC, independent of the CLI technique, in connection with a request for routing information.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Serbetcioglu et al. does not disclose a method or system including transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber in connection with a request for routing information, as recited in the rejected claims.

Thus, the § 102 rejection is traversed and should be withdrawn, and Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11, 12, 14-16 and 18 are allowable.

Additionally, the present Application teaches on page 2 lines 13-21, that information on the identity of the calling subscriber can be transmitted in a CLI, but such transmission is not always successful as all networks do not support the network signaling used in transmission of the calling subscriber identity. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits

that the CLI technique of Serbetcioglu et al. has already been disclosed in Applicant's own Background section.

Claims 13, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Serbetcioglu et al. in view of Maenpaa (U.S. Patent No. 5,600,705). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because the combined teachings of Serbetcioglu et al. and Maenpaa fail to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in the claims.

As explained above, Serbetcioglu et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest a method or system including transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber in connection with a request for routing information, as recited in independent claims 11, 14 and 16 and rejected dependent claims 13, 17 and 19.

Maenpaa fails to remedy the deficiencies of Serbetcioglu et al. because Maenpaa is merely directed to methods for call establishment including a home location area identifier, and does not disclose, teach or suggest a method or system including transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber in connection with a request for routing information, as recited in the rejected claims.

Therefore, the combined teachings of Serbetcioglu et al. and Maenpaa do not disclose, teach or suggest the method or system recited in claims 13, 17 and 19. Thus, the rejection is traversed and should be withdrawn, and Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13, 17 and 19 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing, the claims are now believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Pillsbury Winthrop LLP

By: 

Christine H. McCarthy

Reg. No.: 41844

Tel. No.: (703) 905-2143

Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

CHM\ASW  
1600 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102

(703) 905-2000